



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,461	08/30/2001	Mick A. Nylander	G00310/US	9414

7590 01/21/2003

GKN AUTOMOTIVE, INC.
3300 University Drive
Auburn Hills, MI 48326

EXAMINER

RODRIGUEZ, PAMELA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3683

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/943,461

Applicant(s)

NYLANDER ET AL.

Examiner

Pam Rodriguez

Art Unit

3683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species A, Subspecies A2 in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 12-19 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species and as have been canceled as of Paper No. 8, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 8.

Oath/Declaration

3. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:
It does not identify the city and either state or foreign country of residence of each inventor. The residence information may be provided on either on an application data sheet or supplemental oath or declaration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the cylindrical mass" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

In line 1 of Claim 9 and in line 3 of Claim 10, the phrase "the mass member" is indefinite. It is unclear which of the plurality of mass members previously claimed, that applicant is referring to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Domer.

Regarding Claim 1, Domer discloses a dynamic damper (see Figure 1) having all the features of the instant invention including: a mass member assembly 1a/1b including a plurality of discrete mass members 1a, 1b, each mass member having an inner surface (see Figure 1 and the inner surfaces of members 1a and 1b extending in-between elements 5), an outer surface (see Figure 1 and the outer surfaces of members 1a and 1b facing elements 6), and an affixing member 3 and 4 for affixing one of the mass members to the other (see Figures 3 and 4 and column 2 lines 51-55), and wherein the mass member assembly 1a/1b is affixable to a rotary shaft (see column 2

Art Unit: 3683

lines 43-51, wherein the torsion bar to which the members are attached is readable as a rotary shaft).

Regarding Claim 2, see tab 3 in Figures 1, 3, and 4.

Regarding Claim 3, see receptacle 4 in Figures 1, 3, and 4.

Regarding Claim 4, see Claim 1 above and further note that Domer discloses a plurality of elongated connecting members 3 and 4 each extending radially inwardly from the inner surface of each mass member 1a and 1b toward the rotary shaft (see Figures 3 and 4) thereby defining a plurality of spaced apart attachment surfaces 5, wherein each of the spaced apart attachment surfaces 5 secures the damper in the closed position to the shaft, wherein the mass member assembly is spaced apart from the rotary shaft and being supported by the connecting members 3 and 4 directly contacting the shaft to allow the mass member assembly to vibrate by resonance (see column 2 lines 43-55 and Figures 1, 3, and 4), and the connecting members 3 and 4 being subjected substantially to compressive deformation between the mass member assembly and the rotary shaft.

Regarding Claim 5, note that the torsion bar would inherently have a central axis of rotation and that each of the spaced apart attachment surfaces 5 would align in a direction parallel thereto.

Regarding Claim 6, see Figures 3 and 4.

Regarding Claim 9, see Figures 3 and 4.

Regarding Claim 10, see Figures 1, 3, and 4.

Regarding Claim 11, see Figure 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Domer.

Regarding Claims 7 and 8, Domer discloses most all the features of the instant invention as applied in paragraph 6 above, except for the connecting members being formed of an elastic material, in particular rubber.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have constructed the connecting members of Domer to be formed of an elastic rubber material as a matter of design preference, dependent upon the desired type of engagement between the two mass members. Constructing the

connecting members to be rubber would allow for some flexibility between the connecting members to enable them to have some "give" when affixed to one another. This elasticity would help prevent shearing of the connecting members upon excessive force applied to the rotary shaft.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kuwayama and Gallmeyer et al both disclose dynamic dampers having mass members and connecting members similar to applicant's.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pam Rodriguez whose telephone number is 703-308-3657. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday from 6 am to 4 pm and Tuesdays from 6 am to 12 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Lavinder can be reached on 703-308-3421. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3683

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.



Pam Rodriguez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3683

1/13/03

pr
January 13, 2003